

## Minutes of Waukesha County Airport Operations Commission

December 8, 2010

Vice-Chairman Bluemke called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

**Commissioners Present:** Schoepke, Falstad and Richards. Chairman Crowley absent.

**Others Present:** Kurt Stanich, Airport Operations, Val Ramos- Airport Administration, Bob Groh, Tony LaShay, Walters Builders (Bob Groh), Keith Markano, Airport Manager, Andrew J Kanehl.

### **Approve modify minutes of Minutes of November 10, 2010**

MOTION: Secretary Richards moved with second by Commissioner Falstad to approve November 10, 2010 minutes. Motion carried.

**Public Comment/Correspondence** – Vice-Chairman Bluemke recognized Andy Kanehl.

**Mr. Kanehl** – Disappointed Chairman Crowley not present today because he has better understanding of this subject. On today's meeting agenda there is an item on status of 2317 Aviation Drive lease termination. Mr. Kanehl thought this determination was already made and he understood that. After his lease was terminated, Robert Groh submitted an application for this lot. But, at the November Commission meeting there was no decision made if Mr. Kanehl had the right to re-apply for the lot after his lease agreement was terminated. Mr. Markano was to meet with Corporation Counsel for a final decision on this. Mr. Kanehl was surprised to see another agenda item for the discussion and action of hangar constructions plans for lot 2317 Aviation Drive by Robert Groh. He was under the impression that he was still going to be allowed to work things out and continue with his plans for hangar construction on this lot. Had he known he could have re-applied for the lot he would have been the first in line to sign up. In his conversations with Chairman Crowley his understanding was that Chairman Crowley was trying to find a way to have Mr. Kanehl re-apply for the lot. Mr. Kanehl is totally confused by what is happening here today.

**Vice-chairman Bluemke** – It is unfortunate that Chairman Crowley is sick and could not attend today's meeting. Chairman Crowley would not do anything differently from last month's meeting. At last month's meeting it was concluded that Corporation Counsel come back to the Commission with an answer and Corporation Counsel called Mr. Markano this afternoon with a final decision for the Commission. This is the reason for item number three on today's agenda and there is no further action.

**Mr. Kanehl** – He understands that. The question he had was could he re-apply for the lot after termination.

**Vice-chairman Bluemke** – Understands Mr. Kanehl did not get anywhere with answer to re-applying question. There were a number of unfortunate situations Mr. Kanehl had and prior to his coming in to speak with Mr. Markano, another application was received for the lot and this is also on today's agenda.

**Mr. Kanehl**- Problem is that Mr. Kanehl did ask about re-applying and was never given an answer, this is his argument, that he was never given a proper answer, never directed of what he could do.

**Commissioner Schoepke** – Does the Commission have a determination from Corporation Counsel? If yes, we could go to next agenda item on this subject.

**Mr. Markano** – The Commission had questions for Corporation Counsel at last month's meeting. When a lease is terminated is there an ordinance in the lease that will prevent an individual from applying for a new lease? The answer to this question is no, there is not an ordinance barring that. Can an individual in this situation apply for a new lease? Answer to this question is yes but as part of the process the Commission can and should consider previous experiences with the applicant. In the lease there are rules on defaults, the time and type of correspondence and the mailing process. The County followed the lease procedures and the directives from Corporation Counsel.

**Vice-chairman Bluemke** – Regarding Mr. Kanehl's problem on re-applying, there will be no additional action from the Commission on this. Mr. Kanehl's comments are appreciated and will be duly noted. Neither the Commission nor anyone else is against Mr. Kanehl coming to the airport. But circumstances developed and an application was submitted prior to his question of re-applying.

**Status of 2317 Aviation Drive (Andrew Kanehl) lease termination:** Mr. Markano met with Corporation Counsel on December 6<sup>th</sup> to review the lease and correspondence associated with Mr. Kanehl. Corporation Counsel contacted Mr. Markano a little after 4 P.M. this afternoon (December 8<sup>th</sup>). Corporation Counsel discussed this matter with outside legal counsel. It is appropriate to consider the lease terminated at this time and to move forward with the application from Mr. Robert Groh. (No action necessary by Commission)

**Discussion and action on hangar construction plans, 2317 Aviation Drive (Robert Groh)** – Plans were received from Mr. Groh last week. Mr. Markano and the airport's engineer have reviewed the plans to ensure compliance with the covenants of the southwest hangar area. The proposed hangar is a Walters Building structural timber hangar with steel exterior. The plans received were generic and missing some details. Mr. Groh's engineer was contacted regarding the discrepancies and waiting for an updated set of plans. Those plans have not been received in our office. Per Mr. Markano's discussion with Corporation Counsel regarding the previous agenda item, the Commission can move forward with this proposal with the understanding that there may be some legal ramifications. The Commission should move a little more slowly with this, but that should not be a problem since the plans have yet to be approved by the Commission, the City and construction would not start until Spring of 2011. Corporation Counsel will work with Mr. Markano and Mr. Groh on the specifics of the lease. There was some confusion at the last Commission meeting on Mr. Groh's application. Initially Mr. Groh expressed interest in the Southeast Hangar Area and was given those materials. When the Southwest Hangar area lot became available he was given those (SW area) materials. Both applications were submitted. The Southeast application, the one that drew attention at the November meeting, is not applicable for the Southwest Hangar area. The single page application with the \$500 deposit is applicable to this lot. The application with the deposit holds the lot for six months or until such time we receive and approved the hangar construction plans and enter into a lease agreement with Mr. Groh. At this time it is not necessary for the Commission to take action since the new set of plans requested have not been received.

**Secretary Richards** – When an application is submitted is the applicant receiving all of the information necessary for hangar construction (time frame)?

**Mr. Markano** – This information is explained on the application.

**Secretary Richards** – Does the applicant sign off on this application.

**Mr. Markano** – Yes.

**Secretary Richards** – So it is up to the applicant to follow the procedure as specified?

**Mr. Markano** – Yes, the applicant is given a copy of the Minimum Standards and the hangar area covenants at that time.

**Mr. Markano** – Mr. LaShay can drop off a new set of plans when all of the changes are made and they can be sent to our engineer for review. Approval of the hangar construction plans by the Commission can be an agenda item for the next meeting.

**Vice-chairman Bluemke** – Mr. Markano can work with Mr. LaShay and Mr. Groh on the necessary changes to the plans and any questions they may have for Mr. Markano. No action necessary by the Commission, continue with item #5.

**Chairman's Report** – No report from Chairman Crowley for Vice-chairman Bluemke to present so Mr. Markano will give his report to the Commission.

**Airport Manager's Report** –

**T- Hangar update** (October storm damage) – the County received quotes from three contractors and they were all in excess of \$25,000 which is the bid threshold. This required the County to bid out the project. Bid documents were quickly put together with the help of the Facilities Department and Structural Engineering Group (several years ago they did an analysis for the County on T-Hangar repair). Because of the extent of the roof damage and condition of T-hangar 674 Northview, there was discussion with the Department of Administration the possibility of demolishing and replacing the hangar. There have been several meetings since then and Mr. Markano put together several different net present value and return on investment analysis. The first meeting was with the Airport's budget analyst, the last meeting was with Norm Cummings (DOA) and Allison Bussler (Public Works). DOA requested more information, which Mr. Markano supplied. Mr. Markano will meet with Allison next week to decide if the hangar will be repaired, demolished or reconstruct. Hopefully the hangar will be reconstructed.

**Vice-chairman Bluemke** – The Commission should have all of the details to review and give a recommendation for the hangar.

**Mr. Markano** – The recommendations will probably come back to the Commission before a final decision is made.

**17<sup>th</sup> continuing resolution bill** passed the House this week but it still had not gone to the Senate. We are potentially looking at six months of AIP funding.

**Gate 11-** Construction completed and gate ready for use on Tuesday before Thanksgiving, the gates take five seconds to open.

**Snow removal** – The first snow removal of the season went very well. Everything was cleared up and the airport looked good.

**Gate Project** – Last month the Bureau of Aeronautics put out a press release about the gate project. I was contacted by Kate Golden, Wisconsin Watch.Org, about an investigative report she was working on regarding deer strikes. Mr. Markano spoke with her at length

on the phone about fencing at the airport and specifically of the ten foot fence project. She asked if the six foot fence was high enough to keep deer out. Mr. Markano said deer are able to jump the six foot fence and roam airport grounds.

**Vice-chairman Bluemke** – Article by Steve Bukosky in Waukesha Now publication, November 4, 2010, should be on record as well as Chairman Crowley's response to Mr. Bukosky. Chairman Crowley's response was excellent.

**Mr. Markano** – Miss Golden came out to the airport and Mr. Markano gave her a tour of the airport. Miss Golden took pictures of the new fence. She also saw deer tracks going up to the fence and going back out to the tree line because they could not jump the fence. Miss Golden's article will be published sometime in January and Mr. Markano will forward this information to the Commission so they can read the article.

**Grass cutting** – Final invoice from J & N Lawn Services received, the contractor that failed to complete mowing services at the airport. They owed the Airport a balance of \$5,597. DOA will collect the remaining balance for the Airport. Some mowing areas will go out for re-bidding next year and the Highway Division will mow the other areas at the airport. Highway Division worked out great this year with grass cutting and the tree clearing got rid of the deer habitat inside the fence at the airport.

**Office Supplies** – The County has a contract with a new supplier, Office Max. This is a contract with multiple agencies and will save the County money.

**Software** – Updating the software for the access control system (Honeywell Pro-Watch Program), standard system for aviation. Mr. Markano and Mr. Stanich attended a seminar on the new 3.8 software package the airport will be using. Mr. Markano explained how this software will be interfaced, and the advantages it will provide including the Control Tower being able to access entrance using their I.D. cards instead of using the cipher lock system.

**Pyrotechnics storage** – Mr. Markano received some information from Peter Drahn, Director of the Wisconsin Airport Management Association (WAMA) of a change to the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) rules and regulations regarding storage of pyrotechnics for wildlife control. Mr. Markano did not know about this, it was not in any of the publications he received. Starting May 1, 2011 there are 100 hundred pages of new rules on bird bombs and screamers. What this means is that each user will be required to obtain a permit unless they are a County or Government agency (private airports would need a permit). The airport will need to apply for a permit exemption and for storage of bird bombs and screamers (they are considered an explosive device) they will need to be kept in a type two magazine. A type two magazine (small box) for storage will cost \$421.00. This is a federal regulation and the bird bombs come under this explosives regulation. Seven day inventories are required and when they are expended they must be recorded (the number, date and time of how many and type of shells used).

**Tower Activity and Fuel reports** – Mr. Stanich presented the reports to the Commission. Tower activity is down about 4% on the year and 18.6% on the month. Fuel flowage continues to be up we are up 9% on the year, very good, and 1 and ½% up on the month. This is being driven by the 100 low lead sales, a strong showing of jet traffic.

Competition pricing analysis from the FBO: 16% higher than average on 100 low lead and 12% higher on Jet A sales (per gallon). Waukesha price for 100 low lead is \$5.67, and average price in the region is \$4.76. Mr. Stanich received a call from someone interested in installing a fueling pump at the airport for sale of fuel to the general public. The Minimum Standards were sent to this person for review.

**Future agenda items:**

Sign location  
501C  
Naming rights

**Adjourn**

Bluemke moved, second by Schoepke to adjourn. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned 7:21 p.m.

**Next meeting: Wednesday, January 12, 2011 at 8:00 a.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Dick Richards  
Secretary  
December 8, 2010